World Alliance News Letter

OL. XIX, No. 3 New York, N. Y. March, 1943

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

Britain and America

The months immediately ahead will likely determine whether the United Nations will go ahead to establish an effective nucleus for world organization. The issue is a shorter war or a longer war. The issue is a post-war security system or the preconditions of another conflict. That is the perspective we face. As Sir Stafford Cripps said on February 6:

> To wait until hostilities have ceased, till the binding force of the common danger is no longer present, is to miss the chance of common agreement. During the time of war, when the feeling of cooperation is still strong, is the moment to concert common action for the period after the war.

If the United Nations are to move forward, if this historic opportunity to build a stable and relatively just society of nations is to be realized, the help of every group committed to international friendship and cooperation is necessary. We need to explore practical ways to strengthen the understanding and joint action of the member countries. We need to see clearly the obstacles which stand in the way of effective cooperation and learn how to deal with them. We need to stress common interests and aims which offer a firm foundation for cooperation and friendship. These are urgent tasks, and the NEWS LETTER proposes to devote a number of issues to the relations of the United States and the other United Nations.

Great Britain, our close friend and greatest competitor, is a logical starting point, for Anglo-American cooperation is one of the cornerstones of the grand alliance. Whatever the minor or major difficulties of cooperation may be, this fact must be put at the masthead: No stable organization of nations is possible without American and British participation. Consequently cooperation is indispensable to the well-being of both peoples. Here, in this mutual need, lies the solid ground for friendship. If there are enough people in both countries determined to see that national policy serves this end, which is part of a larger objective, all barriers to cooperation can be overcome.

The obstacles to effective cooperation may be summarized in two questions. Many Americans are asking, "How much freedom will Britain grant to the dependent peoples of the Empire?" Many in Britain are asking, "How much responsibility will the United States assume for guaranteeing post-war security?" These phases oversimplify the difficulties but they indicate their nature. The issues were raised at a recent international conference held in Canada, as reported by Frederick V. Field in the *Far Eastern Survey* of January 11:

> The Americans, supported by representatives of the Dominions and of China stated that in their countries there was considerable, and in some instances widespread, uncertainty as to whether or not the British really adhered to what the questioning countries believed to be meant by the Atlantic Charter. The British, supported by the Dutch, wanted to know whether the Americans could give them any assurances that American public opinion would approve their nation's participation in a post-war system of international security, or, as after the last war would insist upon withdrawing into political isolation.

The problems are in fact interdependent. Sir Norman Angell stressed one aspect of this relationship when he said on March 11:

> Collective Security is the *sine qua non* of international justice—the only means by which it can be made possible.

Since collective security and international justice are closely linked, they need to be dealt with together. On either side of the Atlantic, citizens need to concentrate their attention on those international policies for which they bear most direct responsibility—unless it is possible for like-minded groups in the two nations to join in making a common approach to the connected problems of security and justice. This last is ultimately the most promising way to approach international issues.

The course of the war has speeded up the process of "mixing together" the life of the two countries. Consultations by leaders, as the current visit of Anthony Eden, are welcome signs that joint planning is growing. Yet if the process is to persist and to become an integral part of the United Nations machinery, it needs to be reinforced by the efforts of ordinary folk here and in Britain. The task requires a more intensive education to convince our peoples that international problems must be dealt with in an international way. It requires a clearer appreciation of the value and need for Anglo-American cooperation within the framework of the United Nations. It requires the development of more adequate machinery for the exchange of frank and forward-looking views by like-minded groups in the two nations. Church members have a major contribution to make to each of these requirements.

A Charter for Today

A promising and progressive resolution on the organization of the United Nations has been drafted by a bi-partisan group in the Senate: Senators Ball, Burton, Hatch and Hill. The text of the resolution is as follows:

> Resolved, that the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority:
>
> 1. To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.
> 2. To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations' forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.
> 3. To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations' forces.
> 4. To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.
> 5. To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations' military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.
>
> That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations' organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

Upon the fate of this resolution may depend not only the peace, but conceivably the war. The debate which looms in the Senate and in the country may well determine whether the most powerful nation will move forward to international cooperation and organization or backward to "isolationism" and imperialism. The introduction of this resolution is a call to political action for all who believe in winning both the war and the peace.

Political Propositions

The Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace, 297 Fourth Avenue, issued on March 19, in a simple and practical form, six political objectives for study and action by the American people. The publication of these aims is a welcome sign of growing concern among American churchmen to implement principles of world order. Copies of the statement, with explanatory notes, may be secured from the Commission's office for 5 cents per single copy. The six propositions are as follows:

> 1. The peace must provide the political framework for a continuing collaboration of the United Nations and, in due course, of neutral and enemy nations.
> 2. The peace must make provision for bringing within the scope of international agreement those economic and financial acts of national governments which have widespread international repercussions.
> 3. The peace must make provision for an organization to adapt the treaty structure of the world to changing underlying conditions.
> 4. The peace must proclaim the goal of autonomy for subject peoples, and it must establish international organization to assure and to supervise the realization of that end.
> 5. The peace must establish procedures for controlling military establishments everywhere.
> 6. The peace must establish in principle, and seek to achieve in practice, the right of individuals everywhere to religious and intellectual liberty.

Christians and Jews

A mass meeting to protest the Nazi persecution of Jews was held in Madison Square Garden on March 1, under the auspices of the American Jewish Congress, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Church Peace Union and the Free World Association. The Right Rev. Henry St. George Tucker and Dr. Henry Atkinson spoke.

A message from Arthur Cardinal Hinsley, Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, denounced the persecutions "with utmost vigor and in accord with the declarations of the Church" and spoke of "the lesson of stern retribution." A message from the Archbishop of Canterbury stated:

> I trust that our two nations may unite in offering all possible aid and place of refuge for Jews now threatened with massacre and so do what we can to mitigate the most appalling horror in recorded history.

A small ray of light on a dark and terrible scene is the recent successful transfer to Palestine of 1234 Jewish refugees from Poland including 834 children, and 270 Jewish children from Rumania.

War Relief Services

A Catholic organization to aid in post-war reconstruction, particularly in Europe, has been set up by the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The formation of the new agency, War Relief Services, was announced on March 11. The organization will be separate from the agency providing current relief, the Bishops' War Emergency and Relief Committee. The new body is headed by the Right Rev. Msgr. Bryan J. McEntegart of New York, director of the children's division of the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York. Two immediate aims of the agency were described as follows:

> First, it will seek a more extensive coordination of the resources and skills of Catholic organizations and agencies of mercy throughout the nation. Secondly, it will provide a ready link with Catholic agencies abroad, a tie that is expected to prove most helpful in the dispensing of post-war assistance.

Britain Today

Great Britain, first of all, is an island about one-third the size of Texas whose population of 46 million is about one-third as large as that of the United States. How this island people, after the fall of France and the loss of mechanized military equipment, stood off the air power and invasion threat of the most terrible war machine yet devised is one of the miracles of modern history and a major turning-point of the war.

It is important for us to understand as best we can the effect of the "Blitz" and invasion peril upon British life and thought. One result has been full mobilization. The British Information Services have pointed out that "more than 2 out of every 3 persons between the ages of 14 and 65 are working full-time in the armed forces, civilian defense or industry." Many more are engaged in part-time work. Seven out of ten boys and girls aged 14 to 17 are doing war work.

Women as well as men are subject to conscription. On February 22 the age limits for the draft of women were extended from 20-30 to 19-45. Before this nearly half of the women aged 18-65 were engaged in full-time work in the armed forces, the Land Army, munitions industry or other essential services. The list of jobs performed by women from manning anti-aircraft guns to unloading freight cars and driving tractors is almost incredible. Even more so is the way in which married women combine full-time war work with their regular housework.

The mobilization of human resources has been matched by mobilization of financial and economic resources. Luxuries and waste have been practically eliminated and rationing of food and clothing is much more rigorous and complete than in this country. Total war production in 1942 was about 50 per cent greater than in 1941. Food production increased about the same amount, permitting an important reduction in food imports. For this war production Britain was paying in December 1942 about $60 million a day—some $56 billion since September 1939—or 67 per cent of the national income.

To pay for part of this cost, taxes have risen steeply. During the present fiscal year, according to the Federal Reserve *Bulletin* for December 1942, the British people are paying $10,300,000,000 out of a national income of $28 billion, or nearly 37%, for all taxes aside from social security taxes. In addition, by December 1942 the British people had lent over $18 billion in war savings in three years, or $424 per person. Nearly one-third of the total is reported to have been loaned by small savers. On March 6, a series of "Wings for Victory" weeks was launched with a goal of $2,400,000,000 in war savings.

Despite all the sacrifices and regimentation the war has required, the people of Britain have preserved in full force their democratic spirit. Self-imposed discipline has lightened the burden of government regulations and given their freedoms greater dignity. The rights of minority groups have been watched. The people have maintained undiminished, in the words of Lord Beaverbrook, "the ancient right to criticize and find fault with their government."

The "Blitz" was no respecter of persons, and common perils and sufferings have helped to bridge some of the social divisions. The destruction of slum dwellings and evacuation of city children revealed to many of the wealthier class the evil conditions of living to which the poor have been subjected. Air-raid shelters, soup kitchens and later British Restaurants for group feeding have promoted greater fellowship. The air raids which have killed or wounded 100,000 people have also destroyed or damaged 1 out of every 5 dwellings in Britain. Consequently there is a great incentive for better housing projects and city reorganization. School children, for example, have been working on models and schemes for improving their home towns after the war.

The perils and sacrifices of the war have extended and intensified concern for freedom from want, expressed in the social insurance plan submitted to Parliament by Sir William Beveridge in December. The essence of the plan is an over-all insurance to provide benefits for the various elements of economic insecurity: education, unemployment, re-training, medical and hospital treatment, disability, maternity, retirements, and funerals. Payments and benefits are worked out at fixed rates and not in proportion to income earned. According to published figures the insured employee would pay about 28 per cent of the cost, the employer about 21 per cent and the government 51 per cent. Sir William's scheme extends the present social services in Britain and roughly doubles current benefits.

The British concern for post-war economic planning is shared by groups in the United States, reflected in the two reports of the National Resources Planning Board submitted to Congress on March 10. Both efforts are attempts to contribute not only to national well-being, but to the common cause of the United Nations. As Sir William wrote in the introduction to his report:

> The belief that the object of a government in peace or war is not the glory of rulers or race, but the happiness of the common man . . . unites the United Nations and divides them from their enemies.

The corollary of this proposition is equally true, however. The Beveridge report points out that freedom from want depends not only upon an adequate plan for social security adopted during the war and productive employment after the war but also upon the organization of peace.

Britain and the Empire

Great Britain is not only an island democracy; it is also the center of an empire of 500 million people and one-fourth of the land surface of the globe. The British Empire is a complicated system of interrelationships between peoples on every continent. There is, first of all, the British Commonwealth of Nations. There is India, an empire in itself, composed of 11 provinces in British India and 562 "islands" held by native rulers. About three-fourths of the Empire population is crowded in India. There are fifty or more crown colonies, protectorates and mandates, governed by British administrators. Some of the mandates are held by South Africa, Australia and New Zealand.

Within the Empire there are some 70 million people of European stock, chiefly British, and roughly 430 million of non-European stock, chiefly Asiatic and African. The white population resides chiefly in the Commonwealth of six sovereign states, which became independent Dominions through the Statute of Westminster in 1931.

One of the difficulties in Anglo-American understanding is that Englishmen tend to view the Empire in terms of the increasing self-government of the Dominions and the economic and international security provided by imperial bases, while Americans tend to view the Empire in terms of the dependent peoples and their need for self-government and economic security. Across the Atlantic problems of the Empire are "family" problems. On this side, they are more often regarded as world problems. These generalizations, of course, need to be qualified, but they indicate the difficulty of securing an objective understanding of important issues.

The overshadowing problem of the Empire is the problem of India, a keystone of imperial power by reason of its manpower, resources, and strategic position. Whether the energy of the Indian people will reinforce, hinder or make little difference to the United Nations war effort is a matter which concerns all of the member peoples. While the Indian situation is too complex to outline here, three points might be made.

In the first place, British rule in India has been a mixture of good and bad. The subjugation and control of weaker peoples is always far from an ideal relationship. The history of the American Indian is a case in point. The case of the other Indians is no exception. Britain has not held India for altruistic reasons. Nevertheless British rule has been more humane than most empires—infinitely more so than the rule of the Axis powers in their empires. Mass education and industrialization have been inadequate. The shadow more than the substance of power has been yielded to the demands for representative government. But on the other hand, a network of railroads has been developed, important irrigation and sanitation projects undertaken and a considerable amount of order maintained with a comparatively small army and corps of administrators supplemented by English-trained Indians. The British *Raj*, despite the use of "divide and rule" tactics, has permitted the development of many of the preconditions for a strong Indian state.

In the second place, it seems clear that the movement for independence is growing. Promises of Dominion status, made first by Lord Halifax as Viceroy in 1929, reiterated increasingly since then, are a recognition of the strength of this movement. Many in Britain, moreover, acknowledge the possibility of complete independence. Indeed, there seems little hope at present for any intermediate status betwen British rule and complete self-government.

The spearhead of the independence movement is the Indian National Congress, the main political party of India. The strength of the Congress was reflected in part in the 1937 elections held under the Constitution of 1935 (which provided for assemblies in the provinces under the Viceroy and his Council). The Congress party succeeded in winning control of 8 of the 11 provincial governments. There are, it is true, many internal obstacles to independence—illiteracy, and divisions between Hindus and Moslems, castes and outcasts, the common people and native rulers, conservatives and radicals, pacifists and non-pacifists. Nevertheless the long-term trend seems to be in this direction.

The third point is that the process is not likely to be easy or automatic. History offers few precedents for such a course. The economic and military importance of India to Britain should be remembered. Winston Churchill stated in 1935 that "2 out of every 10 Englishmen depend on India." Furthermore, the independence movement is not yet unified or strong enough to compel a transfer of the key sources of power, defense and taxation, from British to Indian control. Consequently, the prospect of a long struggle is real.

Perhaps a solution can be found, if the problem is approached as an integral part of the United Nations strategy. The importance of India as a secure and cooperative base against Japan and in the organization of peace makes the issue larger than an Anglo-Indian concern. Any less inclusive approach would naturally be resented by Britain—particularly as the United States has unsolved problems of its own such as the incomplete emancipation of the Negro people. If India is to be recognized and handled as an international problem, it needs to be dealt with as part of a more general settlement by the United Nations—a settlement which will provide the British as well as the Indian people with better security than that provided by British rule in India.

Britain and World Security

Before the development of the submarine and airplane Britain's island position was comparatively secure. Industrial progress matched with the spirit of her people provided the country with a strong navy to guard the coasts and keep open the life-lines to the Empire. The perfection of the new weapons during the present war has gravely endangered her security. The island of Britain after the war will inevitably be "closer" to the mainland of Europe than in the past.

A second line of defense for Britain has been the balance of power in Europe. The divisions among the European powers enabled Britain to devote more attention to imperial problems than would otherwise have been possible. The Royal Navy could be used to extend and defend the distant sections of the Empire. The old balance of power, however, has been undermined by the growth of German industrial strength and destroyed, at least for the time being, by Hitler's conquests. To cope with the new situation, Britain has signed a treaty of mutual assistance with the Soviet Union, which looks to the future as well as to the present. It is an agreement for 20 years. While this shift in policy may bring some stability to post-war Europe, it is almost certain that Britain will be far more involved in European affairs than in the past. For both reasons, Britain's ability to defend the distant parts of the Empire will probably be reduced.

A third factor, tending to the same conclusion, will be the weakened economic position of Britain. For a number of years, Britain's export trade, a key source of her power, has been hard hit. Within the Empire, as well as without, this situation has existed, due chiefly to the growing industrial strength of the Dominions and of the United States. The Ottawa agreements of 1932 checked but did not reverse the trend. In 1938 Britain imported 20 per cent more than in 1913, but exported 16 per cent less. The excess of imports over exports had risen from 21 per cent to 73 per cent. The interest on foreign investments, which helped to compensate for this gap, will also be reduced after the war, since Britain has had to sell many of these investments to pay for war supplies. Professor E. H. Carr suggests that the interest may drop from £200 million in 1938 to perhaps £50 million after the war.

It is natural therefore that the policy of the United States is of major concern to the people of Britain. The British fear is expressed by Professor Carr:

> One of the gravest dangers ahead is that American influence will be employed to frame a peace settlement of a character which could be maintained only by American power, and that American power will not in fact be available to maintain it.

To understand the key problems of Anglo-American relations, we in this country need to realize that British decisions are conditioned by uncertainty over American post-war policy and the fear that it will be irresponsible and isolationist.

Three real alternatives confront America:

One is the traditional policy here and abroad of opportunism. That term is more in keeping with the reality of the policy than the more familiar term "isolationism", for no state can really be isolated in the interdependent world of today. Opportunism means a free hand in world affairs, without commitments. It means a "seven-ocean navy" and extended national bases. It means uncertainty, irresponsibility, and ultimately insecurity. At times this policy can postpone war. In the end it makes war inevitable. An opportunist policy after the war would seem well calculated to weaken British security as well as to endanger our own, and to cause innumerable Anglo-American frictions over trade and strategic bases. It is no road to friendship.

A second possible course is the policy of alliance with Britain in some form or other. Proposals have ranged from a tacit gentleman's agreement to federal union. The rise of the Axis menace has greatly extended the amount of Anglo-American cooperation in the past few years. Some experts have noted that the United States has tended to follow British initiative in Europe, at least until recently, and that Britain has tended to follow American initiative in the Far East. Economic cooperation is far advanced. Oliver Lyttelton, Minister of Production, was reported to have said on January 29 that the United States is now supplying Britain with about 20 per cent of her war supplies, while American troops abroad have been greatly aided by British and Dominion Lend-Lease.

An Anglo-American alliance might, temporarily at least, increase the possibilities of world order, but it is an open question whether it would promote international justice. Because of the economic predominance of the United States, it would probably mean American hegemony over the Empire, and hence would vitiate Anglo-American friendship. Most important of all, it might well inspire a fatal coalition against the alliance, such as Hitler has attempted but failed to achieve.

The third choice has been created by the war, the policy of a United Nations coalition. The development of a real council of the United Nations could offer both Britain and America the security they need. Because of its inclusive character, such a council could lessen the danger of evoking hostile coalitions and enlarge the ability of the member states to overcome any such threat. It would mean yielding opportunist policies in favor of responsible and specific commitments. It would mean yielding certain important imperial privileges in favor of genuine cooperation. But it could offer a real *quid pro quo* in return—world security.

A United Nations Conference

On February 27 the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace issued its Third Report, entitled "The United Nations and the Organization of Peace." We print below excerpts from the first of the four sections of this timely and important document. Readers are urged to secure the full text. (See SUGGESTED READING*)*

The Commission recommends that the United Nations organize themselves, as soon as possible, as a continuing Conference of the United Nations, with such subordinate agencies as are needed, to prepare programs for the future and to develop agreement upon the principles and procedures necessary to build the better world to which they are committed.

This organization is needed during the war. It could state and propagate widely the developing aims of the United Nations; indeed, the mere announcement of its establishment would be an important part of the psychological warfare now being waged. It would help to maintain among the United Nations a sense of participation, of unity, and of confidence in leadership; it would contribute to the morale of the peoples of the United Nations and draw the support of those not in the war, and even of enemy peoples. It could afford a means of arriving at common action. It could reach agreement upon principles and methods with regard to such problems as determination of the extent of military control and the character of the administration to be provided in occupied countries. It could explain allocations of supplies, arrangements for the exercise of authority in occupied areas, and other matters which might occasion misunderstanding or lead to disunity. It would be useful in establishing agencies of the United Nations, and in coordinating their activities.

Obviously, the military conduct of the war could not be given to such a body, partly because of the need of secrecy and immediate decisions, partly because technical knowledge is required, and partly because the actual responsibility for the war rests in fact upon a few great states which could not be asked to submit to the decisions of such an organ.

The most important task of the Conference would be to plan for the future, both for the period of reconstruction and for the establishment of a permanent world order. To this end it should hold frequent meetings and should be assisted by a competent staff of technical experts. In this work all of the United Nations should participate and those nations also which have broken off economic or diplomatic relations with the Axis. From small states there has been in the past so much intelligent contribution to international cooperation that their aid should be eagerly sought. Important studies are now being made by international agencies, by national governments, and by regional groups. Such studies should be encouraged, and regional subdivisions of the Conference may be desirable; but the urgent need now is for study and correlation of national views by an organ representing the United Nations as a whole. The Conference of the United Nations should seek to substitute community aims for separate nationalistic aims.

As victory nears and reconstruction problems emerge, the Conference would grow in strength, and add additional agencies. The entire development of the United Nations cannot now be prophesied, but there can be no doubt of the urgent need of an immediate beginning to prepare solutions for the problems of reconstruction and to set up the permanent organization of the family of nations.

Various other agencies will be needed. Some, such as those for military command, or for distribution of materials, may require much authority and may need to work in secrecy. Some may have important administrative tasks to perform, such as the coordination of production and supply, control of shipping, etc. Others, of a technical character, should be left as free from political control as possible. Still others would confine their activities to research and recommendation. Arrangements to feed and administer occupied areas are part of post-war rebuilding. Doubtless military forces used to win the war will be continued for a time as a United Nations' police in some areas. Such possibilities of later usefulness should be kept carefully in mind as the war agencies of the United Nations are developed.

A number of combined staff groups and other agencies have thus far been created for war purposes. These are, to a large extent, bilateral arrangements between the United States of America and other countries, tied together chiefly by the Lend-Lease arrangements. There are other groups, such as the Inter-Allied group in London, or the Central and Eastern European Planning Board, and other agreements, such as the Russo-Polish or Anglo-Russian agreements, which may be regarded as supplementary to, or even part of, the United Nations system. These groups have been separately developed to meet particular problems; they are uncoordinated; in no one of them are all the United Nations represented.

It is clear that a more systematic organization of the United Nations is necessary if their fighting force is to achieve maximum efficiency. All of them are contributing to the common effort. Some are producing more than others; some are sacrificing more. The resources of all of them should be pooled; real harmony and understanding between all is indispensable; for purposes of political warfare, the United Nations must present to the enemy an efficient unity. It is unavoidable, however, that with regard to military action, the four great Powers should have a controlling position, since they are the ones who will, as a matter of inescapable fact, have the resources and, therefore, the responsibility.

British and American Churches

According to figures published in the *Statesman's Year Book* for 1942, there were shortly before the war some 43,000 churches, chapels and synagogues in Great Britain. This figure compares with the figure of 244,000 for the United States. Most numerous, of course, were the churches of the Anglican Communion, headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In England it is called the Established Church or Church of England; in Wales it is called The Church in Wales; and in Scotland it is called the Episcopal Church of Scotland. Together, there was a total of nearly 17,000 churches. South of the Border, the Anglican Church is the State Church, and is supported in part by taxes. In Scotland the National Church is the Church of Scotland (Presbyterian), with more than 2,500 congregations. It is not, however, a state church. It is said that about 1 out of every 7 persons in England and Wales belongs to the Established Church and that 1 out of every 3 in Scotland belongs to the Church of Scotland.

There were also nearly 21,000 chapels and churches in England and Wales belonging to the Free Churches: Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian. Catholic churches, chapels and stations in Britain totalled more than 2,600. There were nearly 250 Jewish synagogues.

It is necessary to use the past tense in connection with these figures since nearly 3,000 church buildings, about 1 out of every 15, have been destroyed or damaged by air raids. In some cases, where the damage has been slight, minor repairs have been made. In other instances, "open-air" services are being conducted in bombed sanctuaries. Many edifices have been ruined too completely for use or repair during the war. This situation has produced many fine examples of interchurch cooperation.

The organizations of the British churches are roughly comparable to our own. There is the Free Church Federal Council, the cooperative organization of Protestant denominations other than the Church of England. There is the new British Council of Churches, the overall organization of Christian groups other than the Catholic Church. This agency is carrying on the work of the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility which has produced excellent studies on social justice and world order. The new British Council of Christian and Jews, headed by 5 leaders of the various religious bodies in Britain is designed to combat racial and religious intolerance and study post-war reconstruction.

Two militant movements to secure a closer relationship of religious faith to social life are the Sword of the Spirit movement conducted by Catholic leaders and the Religion and Life movement, now conducted by the Council of Churches. An agreement was reached by the leaders of the two movements for "parallel action in the religious, and joint action in the social and international field." Another group which should be mentioned is the Industrial Christian Fellowship within the Anglican Communion. This group was largely responsible for the Malvern Conference.

The mutual longing for a better world order has already brought about numerous consultations by British and American church leaders. The process is continuing and growing, though much remains to be done for a more general exchange of views and for more effective methods of joint or parallel action on critical international issues. There are, however, opportunities for concrete action by local church groups in both countries to express friendship and fellowship.

The presence of American troops in Britain has been recognized as a chance for better understanding by British church leaders. A letter was sent last Fall to churches throughout Britain by six leaders. The statement, entitled "American Troops and British Churches," said in part:

> Their presence here will give us a priceless opportunity for promoting friendship between our countries. The importance of this not only for the prosecution of the war but also for the future rebuilding of the world on more Christian lines, needs no emphasising . . . . Three obvious lines of action are open to us:
>
> a. A welcome to church services and special care in making them feel at home when they come. Generally speaking, Americans will appreciate a more demonstrative welcome than would be expected or even desired by British soldiers.
>
> b. In some places, help in providing rest and recreation facilities as has been done on so large a scale for other troops.
>
> c. A simple welcome to our homes. There is no need for lavish hospitality or organized parties. Most Americans will appreciate more than anything else a friendly welcome to share in the ordinary life of the home.

American churches need to continue their support of denominational agencies helping British Churches with parish relief or overseas missions. Another opportunity (if action is not too long delayed) is provided by the seed campaign of British War Relief, 730 Fifth Avenue, New York. One dollar will purchase enough vegetable seeds for a family garden—so necessary on the food front. A good example was set church groups on March 2 by the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., who donated $11,000 for seeds for the families of 11,000 British workers. Perhaps the most urgent action open to Americans is to work for support of the United Nations resolution printed on page 2.

SUGGESTED READING

Win the War — Win the Peace — The Story of the Pittsburgh Institute. Published jointly by The Church Peace Union and the World Alliance. May be secured from this office. Single copy 5 cents.

The main addresses of the Conference for Victory and a Free World held in Pittsburgh.

Britain and America

The Church and the New Order by William Paton. 1941, Macmillan, New York, $1.50.

The Hope of a New World by William Temple. 1942, Macmillan, New York. $1.35.

A Christian Basis for the Post-War World. A symposium, 1942. Morehouse-Gorham, New York, $1.00.

Three of the more important books by church leaders in Britain on the application of Christian principles to national and international problems.

Inter-Religious Cooperation in Great Britain by Thomas F. Doyle. 1942, National Conference of Christians and Jews, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, 10 cents.

A good summary of recent developments.

The British Empire Under Fire. *Headline Book* by James Frederick Green, 1940. Foreign Policy Association, 22 East 38 Street, New York. 25 cents.

This pamphlet remains one of the most useful texts for study groups.

Relations with Britain by Raymond Leslie Buell. 1942, *Fortune* magazine, New York. May be obtained by writing to the General Manager of *Fortune*, Time and Life Building, Rockefeller Center, New York.

The survey, the first in a series entitled "The United States in a New World," appeared in the May issue of *Fortune*.

Let the People Know by Norman Angell. 1943, Viking Press, New York. $2.50.

Sir Norman's plea for Anglo-American action to organize collective security is written in the author's usual readable style.

Conditions of Peace by Edgar H. Carr. 1942, Macmillan, New York. $2.50.

The second half of Professor Carr's widely discussed book deals with problems of British policy at home and abroad.

British Labor on Reconstruction in War and Peace. 1943, League for Industrial Democracy, 112 East 19 Street, New York. 15 cents.

The pamphlet contains the interim report of the National Executive Committee of the British Labour Party.

Britain and France Between Two Wars by Arnold Wolfers. 1940, Harcourt Brace. $3.75.

Professor Wolfers analyzes the tragic differences in British and French foreign policy between the First and Second World War.

Out of the People by J. B. Priestley. 1941, Harper & Bros. $1.50.

One of the most important books showing the impact of total war upon the lives and thinking of the British people.

Are Empires Doomed? by Lionel Gelber. 1943, Ryerson Press, Toronto. 40 cents.

The English-speaking peoples are urged to recognize imperial power as the cornerstone of their society.

Empire on the Seven Seas by James Truslow Adams. 1940, Scribners. $3.00.

A readable pro-British history of the Empire since the American Revolution.

India Without Fable by Kate L. Mitchell. 1942, Knopf. $2.50.

An incisive and well-documented study of Anglo-Indian relations. Generally sympathetic to the aspirations of Indian nationalism.

Foreign Policy Reports dealing with problems of Britain include *As Britain Sees the Post-War World* by Howard P. Whidden, Jr., October 15, 1942; *India's Rôle in the World Conflict* by Margaret La Foy, May 1, 1942; *Britain's Wartime Economy: 1940-41* and *Social and Political Changes in Wartime Britain* by James Frederick Green, August 1 and 15, 1941 (25 cents each). A new monthly magazine, *Britain*, is now published by the British Information Services, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York. The price is 10 cents a copy or $1.00 a year.

General

The United Nations and the Organization of Peace. The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, 8 West 40 Street, New York. Single copy, free.

The *Third Report* deals with immediate steps forward (see page 6), common aims, reconstruction, and permanent world order. Important reading. Can be obtained from this office.

War and Peace Aims. United Nations Information Office, 610 Fifth Avenue, New York. 25 cents.

A mimeographed compendium by United Nations leaders. A "must" reference work for groups studying problems of world order.

What is the Church Doing? by Henry Pitt Van Dusen. Friendship Press, New York. Paper, 60 cents; cloth $1.00.

Professor Van Dusen's timely and stimulating study summarizes the work of Christian churches in occupied Europe, in missionary lands, and in the Ecumenical Movement.

World Alliance News Letter published monthly (except for July and August) by the Church Peace Union and the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches (American Council), 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Dr. William P. Merrill, *President, Church Peace Union;* Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, *President, World Alliance;* Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, *General Secretary;* Richard M. Fagley, *Editor.* The *World Alliance News Letter* is sent to all members. Individual membership $1.00 a year. Special quantity rates for churches and schools.

219

Printed in U.S.A.